NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III. SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1834. NO. 23.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or $2,50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.
Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

[*Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year* 1834, *by* P. PRICE, *in the Clerks Office of the Southern District of New-York*.]

ANSWERS
TO
"213 *Questions* without *Answers*,"
By D. De Vinne,
WITH REJOINDERS,
By A. C. Thomas.

6. As "love thinketh no evil," can God *design* the ultimate evil of a single soul?

A. No—but on the contrary he designs their happiness, and this disposition he has attested by his oath. As I live saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live, Ezek. 33. 11. Again throughout a world replete with contrivance and design, there is not one among them all intended to give him pain, but more than ten thousand to give him pleasure. The benevolent design of God is seen every where. Man's free agency was designed to render him capable of a superior happiness to most other creatures; the publication of the law, was designed to direct him in the path in which he might enjoy the greatest good, and even the penalty of death, whether all benefit themselves by its warning or not, was designed to disuade man from that sinful course which must necessarily make him miserable.

Rej. The Question simply is, whether God (whose abstract nature is LOVE) can, *under any circumstances*, design *ultimate* evil—by which is meant, *evil as an end*. I understand the respondent to answer in the *negative*. The passage from Ezekiel has no reference to *ultimate* evil, and is of course irrelative to the Question.

7. As "love *worketh* no ill," can God inflict, or cause, or allow to be inflicted, an endless ill?

A. Yes, see this largely answered on No. 2. For the sake of the general good, even that love which *worketh*, that is, designeth no evil, may inflict an endless evil on the incorrigible and impenitent, in order to deter others from those sins, which should they become universal, would involve the whole race in ruin and misery.

Rej. See the *Rejoinder* on No. 2. The Bible knows of no such characters as the 'incorrigible and impenitent,' in the sense in which those words are used in the above Answer. The respondent supposes, that the greatest good of a part of mankind will be essentially dependent on the interminable wretchedness of the rest. He might as well at once unite with Emmons, Edwards, and others of the same school, and affirm, that 'the sight of hell torments will increase the happiness of the saints forever!'—He intimates that an endless evil may be inflicted in order to deter others from sinning. Who will it deter? He speaks not of the *threatening* in this life, but of the actual *infliction* of an endless evil in the next. I ask again, Who will it deter from sinning? Not those upon whom it is inflicted—not the saints—not the angels:—*Who?*

8. As we are forbidden to be overcome of evil, can we safely suppose that *God* will be overcome of evil?

A. No. not all.

Rej. Let this Answer be remembered God loves his enemies, and God will not be overcome of evil.

9. Would not the infliction of endless punishment prove that God *had* been overcome of evil?

A. No---if God becomes a party against offenders, it is for our sakes; and in order to preserve the moral order of the universe, upon which our happiness entirely depends, and which sin is endeavouring to destroy.

Rej. Does 'the moral order of the Universe,' and the eternal beatitude of the righteous, depend on the infliction of endless punishment? Punishment supposes guilt and guilt disorder. Is moral order dependant on moral disorder? Is happiness dependant on misery?—I maintain, that God must be overcome of evil, before he can consent to the infliction of an *endless evil*.

10. If man does wrong in returning evil for evil, would not God do wrong were he to do the same?

A. There is something too irreverent in this question. We say, however, that God can do no wrong. In drawing parallels, we should beware lest we "*think the Lord altogether such a one as ourselves*."

Rej. I see no irreverence in the Question. The irreverence, if any, is chargeable to the doctrine of endless punishment. If it be wrong in man to return evil for evil, it would be equally wrong in God. The man of the Devil does evil for good; the man of men does good for good and evil for evil; the man of God does good for evil. We should not 'think the Lord altogether such an one as ourselves, but we should ever remember that he is infinitely *better* than we are.

11. Would not endless punishment be the return of evil for evil?

A. No, the sufferer brought it on himself; God declares that he "willed it not." So far from it, the sinner has been returning to his Maker whole series of evils for his good. His existence, his agency, his temporal mercies, the gift of a Saviour, the influence of the Spirit and the long suffering of God, were all blessings freely bestowed upon him, for which he has been returning through his whole life, ingratitude, disobedience, rebellion, perhaps cursing and blaspheming, and has, in addition to all these, so spoiled and demonized the noble and wonderful faculties of that soul which God gave him, as to unfit him for ever for his service.

Rej. The Bible *uniformly* speaks of God as the Judge, and recognizes in him the rewarder of the virtuous and the punisher of the wicked, either mediately or immediately. HE 'will render to every man according to his deeds.' 'Vengeance is mine, *I will repay*, saith the LORD.' '*He* is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him.' Rom. 2, 6.—12, 19. Heb. 11, 6. Is the sinner guilty of an evil? Yes. Is endless punishment an evil? Yes. Would not the infliction of endless punishment on the sinner be the return of evil for evil?—Every unsophisticated mind will at once perceive the force of the Question. And it is useless to affirm, that the sinner brings this evil on himself.—If such an evil be inflicted, the Deity, either mediately or immediately, will be the inflictor of it.

12. As we are commanded to "overcome evil with good," may we not safely infer that God will do the same?

A. God uses every means consistent with Himself and the nature of man, to overcome evil with good. The gift of his Son, the influence of the Spirit, his bountiful providence and patient long suffering, are all designed as means to lead man to repentance. But do they always succeed? Do you always overcome evil with good whenever you try? If not, why? Is it not because man is a free agent, and may resist all your intended good? Do you not perceive that this whole question is founded on this wholly erroneous supposition, that God is the sole irresistible agent, and man a mere passive recipient? As the answer to this question will involve the proofs of man's free moral agency, and will be in the main, the answer to Nos. 35, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, permit me here to enlarge.

The free moral agency of man, I consider to be the pivot on which the whole controversy between us turns. For, if man has not this agency, he is no subject of moral government; his actions are not his own; nor can he on any principles of justice, be praised or blamed for any thing he does. But that man has this ability, that he is this free moral agent in the proper application of that word, being fully capable of performing voluntary actions, and consequently accountable to God for whatever he does in this world; I prove.

1. *From the Scriptures*, to all who will allow their authority. Nothing can be more evident, than that man is addressed throughout them, as one who is capable of performing voluntary actions. To suppose the contrary, would be doing violence to all language and rendering the Bible an unintelligible book. Persuasion and *motives*, not physical force, are the *only* means made use of in the Holy Scriptures to influence man in his conduct. "Oh hadst thou hearkened unto my commandments; How often I would—but you would not; Turn why will you die." Now these passages and a thousand similar ones, are utterly inexplicable on the supposition that God controls man in his choice.

2d. *From that which we experience in ourselves.* Every person who reflects on what passes within himself is as conscious that he acts freely as that he acts at all. He examines and compares, reasons and decides, walks or sits still, and is as perfectly conscious of the freedom of these acts as he can be of their existence. To suppose that he is secretly controlled to do them, is impossible; he might as well suppose that his whole existence is only ideal. Indeed this is one of those truths, which are self-evident: Nothing can be brought in support of it, clearer than itself, and he who denies it, appears to me to be utterly incapable of being convinced by any argument.

3d. *From the common consent of mankind.*—The terms found in all languages, whether rude

or cultivated, are actually constructed on the acknowledged facts of man's agency. The praise or blame, which has ever been passed on our actions; and the laws and accompanying penalties found in all countries, are so many evidences that man has been always considered free both in his volition and acts. No state or kingdom ever passed laws to regulate trees or irrational animals. Blackstone, in his Commentaries on the Laws of England, book iv, chap. 2, in speaking of those who were capable of committing crimes, says, "All may be reduced to this single consideration, the want *or defect of will*. An involuntary act as it has no claim to, so neither can it induce any guilt, the concurrence of the will when it has its choice either to do or avoid, the fact in question, being the only thing that renders human actions either praise-worthy or culpable."

4. *From the absurdity of the opposite doctrine.* Whatever the opinions or theories of men may be about moral, or philosophical necessity, no one ever attempts to reduce it to practice. The greatest advocates for it, falsify their own doctrine in practical life. Are any of them injured in property or character, they are as quick to blame or find redress as any others. To be consistent with themselves, they should resolve it all into order of God, and be content.—The fact is it can never be applied to purposes of life. The denial of man's free agency, is fraught with the most dangerous and disorganizing consequences. 1. It confounds all distinctions between right and wrong; both in religion and morals. 2. By removing moral obligation it would overthrow all order and government both civil and religious. 3. It would merge the moral government of God into that of physical and make the day of Judgment a solemn farce. And, 4. it would materialize the soul of man and subject it to the same laws as dead matter.

Now that doctrine which contradicts Scriptures, our own experience, the common sense of mankind and is fraught with so many frightful consequences *cannot be of God*, but must be from the Father of lies, from the Babel of confusion. And yet this is the doctrine upon which Universalism is founded, although some of its advocates who do not understand themselves, may deny it; for as it is a principle with them '*That God will finally make all men holy and happy*,' the question now is, how is this to be done? The only way on their scheme is by forcing the will. But this is impossible; it implies a palpable contradiction, the will to be forced, ceases to be will. "God has given a power to the human will, so insuperably great, that all the armies of heaven, the host of hell and the united energy of the whole human race, cannot force or subdue it." God may annihilate it, and then, He becomes the sole irresistible agent, the author of sin and the only efficient cause of every thing which is done in Heaven, earth and Hell.

Rej. It would be foreign to the object of these rejoinders, to enter into a protracted discussion of the subject matter of the foregoing Answer. Nor is such discussion necessary. I believe in the *moral agency of man*. I believe he possesses just so much moral agency as would be of any advantage to him. I do not believe, as the respondent states, 'that God will finally make all men holy and happy *by forcing the will*' I know of no Universalist who entertains this idea. We believe the *will* to be subject to the power of *motive* as *matter* is to *physical force*. Motive does not control matter—physical energy does not control the will of an intelligent rational being. There are laws of matter, and there are laws of mind.

When Saul was converted, was any violence done to his will? Was his moral agency infringed? By no means. Yet Saul was the chief of sinners? And we are not slow of heart to believe, that the same Divine influence by which this persecutor of the Church of Christ was converted from the error of his ways, is abundantly able to bring the whole world of mankind into a state of reconcilation to the *Divine will*, without doing the smallest violence to the moral agency of any individual.

I should be pleased to enlarge on this interesting topic, but what has already been offered will be sufficient to show, that the respondent has misconceived the views of Universalists in relation to moral agency—and that, consequently, the mass of the Answer has no bearing on the Question.

13. Would the infliction of endless punishment be overcoming evil with good?

A. No, for this very reason, the sinner who did the evil would not be overcome by the goodness and forbearance of God towards him. All the Divine dealings towards him were designed to effect this very object, but they were not successful; the sinner rejected them and became incorrigible.

Rej. As the respondent has granted that endless punishment would not be overcoming evil with good, he must allow that it would be perpetuating evil by the return of evil *for* evil. We do not feel disposed to limit the Holy One of Israel, by alleging, that he has no *adequate* means at his disposal for the accomplishment of any of his designs.

14. If God hates the sinner, does the sinner do wrong in hating *Him?*

A. This Question is too irreverent; however, we answer yes, because God has never injured him, but so far from it, through the whole course of his life he has been bestowing upon him the choicest blessings of Heaven, which the sinner has been prostituting to the vilest purposes, or trampling them under his feet.

Rej. The Answer of the respondent has changed the form of the Question. He replies in the affirmative in view of the fact, that God *loves* the sinner. The question, as stated, is, 'If God *hates* the sinner,' etc.

15. Is God a changeable being?

A. No—with Him there is no variableness or shadow of turning: He invariably "*loves righteousness and hates iniquity*." This very immutibility of principle causes Him to love or hate according to the moral condition of his creatures.

Rej. In the Ans. to Q. 1, the respondent grants, that God loves his enemies; and he allows above, that God is unchangable. The conclusion is obvious. If God loves his *enemies*, who does he *hate?*—He hates *sin*, says Br. D. Granted—but does he hate the *sinner?* Certainly not, if he loves his *enemies*.

16. If God loves his enemies *now*, will he not always love them?

A. No, in the exercise of this immutable principle, there must be different regards and affections to the same individual under different circumstances of moral character. If God were to love the same individual, when he was bad as when he was good, he himself would be changeable in principle and not immutable. Observe the creature changes, God does not. And as it respects the sinner, God never loved him with a love of complacency, but only of pity, and even that must terminate when the sinner is finally found incorrigible.

Rej. If the *present* moral condition of God's enemies, does not prevent him from loving them, what ground is there for supposing that he will ever hate them? He is immutable. Suppose his present love for them be only a love of pity; he will *continue* to love them with a love of pity. Suppose they change, and become his friends; then, according to the respondent, he will love them with a love of complacency. Can either the love of *pity* or of *complacency* allow the infliction of endless punishment! As to the 'finally incorrigible,' the Bible knows of no such characters.

17 Is it just for God to be "kind to the evil and unthankful" in the present life?

A. Kindness is not an exercise of justice at all, but of goodness. If we confound things we will become bewildered.

Rej. Every action is either just or unjust. There is no medium. Justice is righteousness—righteousness is right doing. God is righteous in *all* his ways, Ps. cxlv, 17.

18. Would it be unjust for God to be kind to all men in the future state?

A. We say again, kindness has nothing to do with justice, they are the exercise of two entirely different perfections, why then attempt to confound them? If God were to treat the good and the bad equally alike, it would show that he *had no regard* to the properties of righteousness and justice, and consequently he would soon loose the esteem for these perfections in the eyes of his intelligent creatures. If God punishes the wicked, or takes part against them, it is for *the sake of the righteous*, whose just claims on his protection and justice he is defending against the injuries of the wicked. The sin of the ungodly overthrows that order and righteousness upon which the happiness of the good depends; now if God were not to support this order, but were to suffer the sinner to break it with impunity, he would be actually *wanting in protection and justice* to the righteous, whose peace and happiness would be destroyed by the sinful acts of others.

Rej Kindness and justice are two entirely *concordant* perfections of Deity. I do not wish to confound them, neither do I wish any one to supppose that an *unkind* act can be *just*, or that an *unjust* deed can be *kind*. God would not be either kind or just to the *sinner*, were he not to punish him according to his deeds. 'He is kind to the evil and unthankful,' and he is unchangable.

19. If all men justly deserve endless punishment, will not those who are saved be saved unjustly?

A. No—But they will not be saved on the principles of justice, but wholly on that of mercy.

Rej. If all men *justly* deserve endless punishment, either they will receive it or justice will be thwarted of its demands. *One* attribute of Deity must not interfere with the claims of another.

20. If God 'will by *no means* clear the guilty,' by what means can just punishment be evaded?

A. God will by no means clear the finally impenitent guilty, who shall be found so in the day of judgment, and who, through the whole course of their probation, have slighted and rejected Jesus Christ who used every means to save them, But those will evade just punishment, who by faith and repentance have turned to God.

Rej. The Bible knows of no such characters as 'the finally impenitent guilty," and it *no where* teaches an escape, on *any* conditions, from justly merited punishment.

21. As no man can measure endless punishment to his neighbor, will endless punishment be measured to *him?* Luke vi, 38.

A. Yes, it may be, but not by his neighbor, but by his Maker against whom he has sinned.

Rej. Read the connexion of the passage cited in the Question. 'Give and it shall be given unto you; good measure . . . . . shall MEN give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.'

22. Would it be *merciful* in God to inflict endless punishment?—that is, merciful to the sufferer?

A. No—mercy has nothing to do with the in-

fliction of punishment; this belongs to justice. Mercy on God's terms the sufferer long before rejected, and therefore can have none.

Rej. 'Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth MERCY; *for* thou renderest unto *every man according* to his work.' Ps. lxii, 12. If endless punishment would not be *merciful* it would be *unmerciful.*

23. Can that be *just* which is not *mereiful?*

A. Yes, Justice and Mercy are two distinct perfections. Truth shows the difference between things, errors tries to confound all distinctions. 'Justice in God is that sovereign rectoral justice by which he maintains his own rights and the rights of others, and gives to every one his due according to that legal constitution which himself has established,' But, "Mercy is a disposition by which God is disposed to succor those who are in misery and to pardon those who have offended him, whenever it can consistently be done, with the maintainance of good government and the consequent well being of all his creatures."

Rej. Justice and mercy are two perfectly *accordant* attributes. Consequently whatever is just cannot be unmerciful.

24. Do not cruelty and injustice go hand in hand?

A. Cruelty desires to inflict unnecessary pain, injustice is a breach of the rule of right—they generally go together.

Rej. If a just act can be unmerciful, a cruel act may be just—for whatever is unmerciful is cruel.—Endless punishment would be unnecessary—consequently cruel and unjust—for it could not benefit either the sufferer, spectator or inflictor.

25. Can that be merciful which is not just?

A. See on Question 23.

Rej. See Rejoinder on Q. 22, 23. 24.

26. Does Divine justice demand the infliction of pain from which mercy recoils?

A. No, For, as we have shown on Question 2, if God were to manifest *no displeasure* against sin at all, or what amounts to the same thing, not to punish it when committed; then, in that case there would *be more misery* than in the present state of things, and consequently mercy as you call it, would have more to recoil at, than when justice maintained order and government, by the inflictions of pain and penalties on the disobedient. So that upon the whole, it is as agreeable to the nature of mercy, as it is to that of justice, that there should be punishments as the best way to secure the greatest amount of that happiness in which mercy delights.

Roj. The reader is referred to the Rejoinder on Q. 2, in which it is shown that the Question was not answered. Does mercy recoil from the infliction of endless punishment? Certainly, if we have any definite idea of the distinction between mercy and cruelty. Then either justice does not demand endless punishment, or it demands the infliction of pain from which mercy recoils.

27. Does divine mercy require any thing that justice refuses to grant?

A. No, mercy never requires lenity and forgiveness, but when they can be granted in perfect *conformity* with the claims of justice or good government. See Question 26.

Rej. Granted. See Rejoinder on Q. 22, 24, 26.

28. If the demands of Divine justice are opposed to the requirements of mercy, is not God divided against Himself?

A. No, God is not divided against Himself, nor are mercy and justice opposed to each other, but on the contrary they always act in perfect conformity. On the plan of the gospel, *Mercy and Truth have met together, Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other.* All the Divine attributes harmonize; justice maintains her claim and mercy can fully exercise her finest and tenderest affections. Universalism would sacrifice justice, to a something called mercy, in which there is neither moral worth nor purity. Were God to surrender the claims of justice, all authority would be dissolved, and infinite *injustice* would be done to the *unaffending part* of his creatures, by letting loose the rebellious upon them to disturb them; if on the other hand, the Government of God were to admit of no forgiveness, the guilty would sink to despair.—To avoid both these consequences, the atonement by Jesus Christ was made. By his voluntary suffering all the ends of Government are at once answered; "No license is given to offence, the moral law is unrepealed, the day of judgment is still appointed, future and eternal punishments still display their awful sanction, a new and singular display of the awful purity of the Divine character is afforded, yet pardon is offered to all who seek it and the whole world may be saved!"—R. Wilson. We will illustrate the mutual agreement between the claims of justice and mercy. Ancient History tells of a king who made a law against adultery, in which it was enacted, that whoever broke it, should lose both his eyes. The first offender was his own son and heir to the crown. The king was an affectionate father as well as a just magistrate. But how were these opposite claims in this case to be adjusted? After a great struggle, he commanded one of his own eyes to be extracted and the other from his Son. Now all this was certainly a striking exhibition; 1. Of the great love of the Father who was willing to loose an eye for the sake of his son; 2. Of his high sense of justice, who was equally willing to mutilate himself that he might maintain its claim, 3. This act of suffering must certainly exhibit to the Son, in a new light the enormity of his crime; and 4. It must have been the most effectual way to eradicate the evil propensity from him, by bringing the united influence of the love and justice of his father to act upon his principles and affections.

Rej The respondent several times, in the course of his Answers, charges the author of the Questions with irreverance. I leave the reader to decide, whether any man can be guilty of greater irreverence, bordering on blasphemy, than is contained in the above story of the king, considered as an illustration of the Divine Government. I have seen it stated, that at a Revival held some two years ago in Connecticut, a clergyman related the following story: A man was bathing in the Nile; he was pursued by a crocodile, and swam for the shore. Here he met another enemy in a tiger. The animal overleaped his mark, and came in conflict with the crocodile. The contest ended in the destruction of the tiger, and in the consequent escape of the man. The preacher went on to apply the story as an illustration: The crocodile represented God, who in justice was pursuing the sinner; the tiger represented the Lord Jesus Christ, who became a victim to Dvine justice, thus opening a way for the sinner to escape!! I ask the reader, whether this story thus applied, is more irreverent and blasphemous than the one detailed in the above Answer?

But let us look at the story of the King. The law (allowing the story to be true) requires the loss of *both the culprit's eyes.* Could justice be satisfied by relinquishing half its claim, even supposing the other half to be visited on the *innocent?*—It could not. The law has nothing to do with any but the lawless and disobedient.

Farther—according to the representation, God has *maimed* himself and his son, both of them being innocent, in order to clear *the guilty,* after solemnly declaring, he would "by *no means* clear the guilty!" And moreover, God has suffered one half, and Jesus the other, of the punishment deserved by those who should subsequently believe, that such a mockery of justice had been sanctioned by infinite mercy! I shudder to think of this awful profanation of every thing sacred and Divine.

As to the assertion, that "Universalism would sacrifice justice to a something called mercy, in which there is neither moral worth nor purity," it passes for just what it is worth. And it comes with an ill-grace from the advocate of a doctrine, which would immolate reason, and justice, and mercy, on the bloody altar of a remorseless and unnatural superstition.

It is obvious, that if justice requires the infliction of endless punishment, while mercy refuses to sanction unmerciful treatment and unnecessary pain, God *is* divided against himself. But these Divine perfections are perfectly concordant in their demands. The justice of God is not unmerciful, nor is his mercy unjust. They cannot be viewed as acting in harmony, unless it be in the light of the testimony, that "it pleased the Father to reconcile all things to himself"

CORRESPONDENCE.

We extract the following from a warm hearted letter recently received from a young ministering brother at the east. He will pardon us for the liberty we have taken in making the extract. May God continue to him an understanding zeal, and grant him strength to accomplish all that a pure heart could desire. Let him 'cast his mite' as often as may be convenient to him. They are ever welcome. The objection he speaks of, we will answer for.

P.

"If I am deficient in returning your weekly favor, attribute it to any thing else than a want of interest in the precious—the glorious cause in which we are all laboring. God forbid that I should ever be deficient here! No—it is dearer to me than life itself. I would part with all things beside; I would give up every thing on earth, even to my dearest friends—rather than loose my interest in the progress of the universal gospel. I would to heaven that I could throw a Napoleon's might and influence into the scale of Universalism. O! that I may live to see it known from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same—to see that period when there shall be no more strife, nor contentions, nor sects, nor names, but all nations shall become one family of loving and beloved children, whose Father is God! 'Twill be blessed—rapturous! Go on, brother, and send out the 'Messenger' of glad tidings unto the ends of the earth, and may the Lord bless you and keep you—may the Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon you and give you peace.

Yours in the faith, —— ——."

☞ By a recurrence to the terms of this paper, first column of the first page, it will be seen that there is an advance of 50 cents, if the subscription is not paid within *six months.* This is worth saving to the subscriber. Three weeks only now remain for each one in arrears for this volume to avail themselves of these terms Much as we want money at this time, we shall be content with the advance price ($2) if it is attended to promptly within the time. Fifty cents will be a good interest to the subscriber. Many no doubt can make returns by merchants who will be visiting the city, and others can remit through their respective Post Masters. Will those interested attend to this?

Religious Notices.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in Weston, Sunday, April 6; North-Salem 13th.

Br. John Gregory, will preach at Rondout Thursday evening, April 10th, and on Sunday 13th.

Conference.—A conference of Universalists will be holden at Branchville, N. J. on the first Saturday and Sunday in May next. Ministering brethren are particularly invited to attend.

Original.

DOCTRINES.---NO. 5.

Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine. 2 Tim. iv, 2.

The doctrine of the atonement comes next to be considered, by which is generally understood the reconciliation, or appeasing the anger of Almighty God. In other words, it is the notion that Jesus Christ has given himself a ransom for men, sustaining the penalty due to their transgressions, and releasing them from their punishment which God's justice demands. I have, in a preceding number, given my views of God's anger, wrath, &c., which are mentioned in the Scriptures, and I shall now point out the impropriety of ascribing these passions to the "God of the spirits of all flesh."

"Anger, (says Buck,) is a violent passion of the mind, arising upon the receipt, or supposed receipt of any injury, with a present purpose of revenge; and *revenge* (he says) is a cool and deliberate *wickedness;* it is forbidden by the Scriptures, and is unbecoming the character and spirit of a peaceful follower of Jesus Christ." Paley remarks, "Imagine our secret sins all disclosed and brought to light; imagine us thus humbled and exposed; trembling under the hand of God; crying out for mercy; imagine such a creature to talk of satisfaction and revenge, refusing to be entreated, disdaining to forgive, extreme to mark and to resent what is done amiss, and you can hardly feign to yourself an instance of more impious and unnatural arrogance."

In similar language to this great man, I would say, imagine our secret sins, and our overt sins, and the black catalogue of the sins of all men, laid upon the innocent Jesus; imagine him trembling under the anger of "present purpose of revenge," of the "Lord, merciful and gracious;" imagine this same Lord and Christ, at the day of final judgment, "refusing to be entreated, disdaining to forgive," and you will have some idea of the prevalent notions concerning the atonement. I may be told that the anger of God is not *man's* anger; that the direful passion of revenge has no place in the Divine mind; but Mr. Buck tells us that "wrath is violent and permanent anger," and that, "the wrath of God is His indignation at sin and punishment of it. The objects of God's anger or wrath, are the ungodly whom He has declared He will punish." If anger is *not* "a violent passion, and a present purpose of revenge" when applied to the Deity, all is granted that I contend for on this point. But what do the believers in vicarious atonement mean when they say that Christ died to appease the wrath of God, to exculpate the sinner from the *avenging* justice of Heaven? What did a certain modern Doctor mean us to understand by the following text, which he wished "were engraven on the front of every Universalist?" "The Lord *revengeth*, and is *furious*, the Lord will take *vengeance* on His adversaries, and He reserveth *wrath* for His enemies." Do they not intend to teach that *wrath* and *anger*, as defined by Buck and others, dwelled in the Divine mind, that it was poured out in all its dismaying fury on "the Lamb of God?"—that had the Savior not been robed in the Divinity, he could not have endured the infinite vengeance, nor made the effectual atonement?

The notion that "infinite anger," or "condign wrath," pervades the Divine mind, will appear incorrect. First, from those passages of Scripture which forbid the indulgence of such passions. "Cease from anger and forsake wrath," Ps. xxxvii, 8. "Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry; for anger resteth in the bosom of fools," Eccl. vii, 9. "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, &c. be put away from you," Eph. iv, 31. "Make no friendship with an angry man, and with a furious man thou shalt not go," Prov. xxii, 24. "An angry man stirreth up strife, and a furious man aboundeth in transgression," xxix, 22. Second, from those passages which call on us to imitate God. "Be ye followers of God, as dear children," Eph. v, 1. "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy," Lev. xi, 44. "Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect," Mat. v, 48. Third, from those that declare the immutability, mercy and long suffering of the Deity, and His benevolence to the evil. "The Lord is of one mind, and who can turn Him," Job. xxiii, 13. "All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth," Ps. xxv, 10. "The Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy," James v, 11. "He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy," Mic. vii, 18. "The Lord is long-suffering and of great mercy," Num. xiv, 18. "God is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil," Luke vi, 35.

Now it is impossible to reconcile those scriptures which require us to put away anger and wrath, with those that call on us to imitate God, if it be true that wrath in the usual acceptation of the word dwells in the bosom of the Almighty. If God reserveth *wrath* for His enemies, how can we be followers or imitators of God if we *love* our enemies, and this we are positively commanded to do: 'Love your enemies, bless and curse not.' If God be wrathful and furious, if He hurls the bolts of His indignation in the awful majesty of His avenging power among the children of men, scattering blight, and curses, and eternal pains, should we not, in order to 'be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect,' grasp at once the besom of destruction, and ride in a whirlwind of unbridled rage among those 'we judge his foes,' 'scattering fire-brands, arrows and death.' Admitting it to be true that the Almighty is possessed of all the anger which our opposing brethren wish to ascribe to Him, the scriptures assure us 'He retaineth not His anger, forever, because He delighteth in mercy.' And if as they affirm the wicked are the objects of His anger, how shall we account for the saying of our blessed Lord, 'God is *kind* to the unthankful and the evil?' By the 'evil,' I understand the 'wicked,' yet Christ declares these are the objects of *kindness* not of 'vindictive wrath.' The great Apostle to the Gentiles says 'But God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.'

I feel fully persuaded that there are no two passages of holy writ which, when rightly interpreted and fairly understood, contradict each other, or, that teach doctrines which are antipodes one to the other. When it is positively declared, 'God is kind to the evil,' that He commendeth His love to sinners, that 'His mercy endureth forever,' &c. there is no passage which affirms that the Almighty is moved by that species of wrath and vengeance which his word forbids, and which are totally incompatible with goodness, love and benignity. We read Rev. xii, 12, 'The devil is come down having great *wrath*.' There may be some propriety in attributing to the devil wrath and anger in accordance with the sense generally conveyed by these words, for 'he was a murderer from the beginning,' and to murderers may justly be ascribed these fell and malignant passions: 'but God is not the author of confusion, but of peace,' 1 Cor. xiv, 33.

I shall be told that 'God is angry with the wicked every day,' Ps. vii, 11; that 'His wrath is against them that forsake Him,' Ezra viii, 22, &c. This I readily admit; but what should be understood by anger and wrath here? Not surely any disposition or conduct of the Deity opposed to the everlasting truth, "GOD IS LOVE." Should I say of a good and pious father, that he is angry with his wicked children every day, meaning that he vented upon them his hottest indignation, devoid of any purpose to reclaim them, I should merit the imputation of a base traducer. But if I intended to convey the idea that he disapproved of their follies, and chastened them for their profit, I should not detract from his goodness or piety. Suppose I should represent this father as the avenger of the iniquities of his wicked children, by his pouring his intense wrath on one of his *innocent* and obedient sons, would I not impeach his justice? Yet this is the doctrine of the atonement? If God's anger and wrath were appeased by the death of Christ, and the fierceness of His infinite vengeance fully assuaged, how can He be angry now every day?

The truth is, God punishes the evil doers; the righteous and the sinner receive the recompense of their doings, and if Christians, when they read and speak of His wrath and vengeance, would bear in mind that "love worketh no ill," that God commendeth His love to sinners, that "He is kind to the evil," &c. they would not attach a signification to these words that contradicts the Divine testimony, and represents the spotless "I am," as "partial, revengeful, and unmerciful." When mention is made of "the day of wrath," the "revelation of God's wrath," &c. many suppose it to mean the inundating flood of Divine vengeance, that is to overwhelm the wicked in the vortex of hell. Nothing can be farther from the truth, than such an hypothesis. It mantles the merciful Jehovah in the lowering clouds of malevolence, the heavens scowl in the darkness of vindictive rage, and "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world," is transformed into an Avenger, riding on the swift-winged lightnings of Almighty vengeance, "giving signs of wo." "The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our King, the Lord is our Lawgiver, and He *will* save us," Isa. xxxiii, 22. B. B. H.

A SHORT SERMON.

'For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.'—Titus ii, 11, 12.

There are three distinguishing characteristics, mentioned in this text, by which we learn the nature of the grace of God. It brings salvation, it is impartial towards mankind, as it appears to all, and it teaches the same lesson to every one. Its salvation, its impartiality, and its power to teach men are its divine qualities which distinguish it from the wisdom of this world, which supposes that men must save themselves, that all men cannot be saved, and is calculated not to teach, but to keep people in ignorance.

The wisdom of this world, which cometh to nought, contends, that if salvation is for all mankind, and if we believe this fact, it will lead us to ungodliness, to worldly lusts, to every thing in short, by which we dishonor and torment ourselves. But our text teaches exactly the reverse. That grace of God which brings us salvation, teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly; that is, to live temperately; righteously; that is, to do right by our fellow creatures, to do as we would be done unto; and godly; that is, that we should live pious, religious lives, doing all things in that way which best suits the mind of our heavenly Father. This is to live godly; all this, the grace of God teaches us to do in this present world. Here is where we need such teaching, and here let us practice these lessons of grace.

THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF MERIT.

"Never mind him," said Sir Joshua Reynolds, to a friend who complained of the sarcasms of a witty enemy—"never mind him, he ownly shows his sense of his own inferiority; 'tis ever the least in talent who becomes malignant and abusive."

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1834.

To the Patrons of the Herald and Watchman.

It will be recollected, that the writer of this article, formerly published the paper at Montrose, Penn. under the above title. But circumstances which it is needless for us now to repeat, interrupted the progress of that paper, at the close of the first vol. in Sept. last—circumstances, too, which it was not possible for us to control, prevented our resuming it as we expected—and circumstances, likewise, after so long an interim seem to forbid our reviving it.

It will be seen by an article below, that we have made arrangements with Br. Price, the proprietor of this paper, to transfer to him our list of subscribers, as we hope, to the mutual benefit of themselves, and of the Messenger. This will account for the fact, that this paper is sent to the former patrons of the Herald. They will not take it unkind that we have made this use of their names. Nor would we insinuate, that they are under obligation to receive and continue this paper, because they were subscribers to that. Yet we have thought it proper to send them a specimen of the Messenger, and beg leave to say:—The Messenger, has ever manifested a spirit compatible with the genius of our religion; its doctrinal character has been fearless and firm, but at the same time sound and temperate; its morals, have been conspicuous and pure—its diction, chaste—its miscellaneous selections, judicious—its original and editorial matter, interesting. And from the talents of its editors, and indefatigable exertions of its conductor, it promises equal merit in future.

In addition to the general character of the paper, a very interesting controversy is now going on, between Abel C. Thomas, of Philadelphia, (Universalist) and Dr. Ezra Stiles Ely, (Presbyterian) of the same place. Both of them are men of the first order of talents. Answers to Br. Thomas' 213 Questions are also forth coming. These will undoubtedly be interesting. And we humbly conceive that it is doing no violence to the truth, nor discredit to any other periodical, to say that the Messenger, as to its mechanical execution and appearance, or the ability with which it is conducted, is equal to any paper of the kind in the Union. Let us, therefore, bespeak from our friends and former patrons, a faithful examination of a few numbers, and if consistent with their feelings, their patronage of this paper. ALFRED PECK.

"HERALD AND WATCHMAN."

We have pleasure in acquainting our friends that we have just closed arrangements with Br. ALFRED PECK, of Montrose, Pa. by which the list of subscribers to the "HERALD OF GOSPEL TRUTH AND WATCHMAN OF LIBERTY," (which Br. P. published in Montrose for one year,) is transferred to the "Messenger and Universalist." With this arrangement we have also engaged the services of Br. P. as a regular writer for our columns. He will not be associated directly in the Editorial department, but will in all cases write over his own initials, for which alone he will be answerable. He is, no doubt, already favorably known to many of our patrons. To those of the "Herald and Watchman" at least, he needs not our recommendation. We trust the arrangement will be to the advantage of all, and if it should result in rendering the "Messenger and Universalist" still more worthy of the present (apparently) increasing confidence in it, the steady and undeviating purpose by which we have been governed from its commencement will be so far accomplished.

But one opinion can be indulged on the importance and NECESSITY of a well conducted Periodical of our order, in this location. We have been ambitious in the past, to present, so far as was in our power, such an one as circumstances seemed to demand. We mean to spare no exertions, within our reach, for the future, to the same end. An increasing list of Patrons is the surest indication that we have not wholly failed in past efforts, and affords the most powerful stimulant for future exertions.

To the Patrons of the "Herald and Watchmen" a few words may be necessary, on the difference of price in the papers. Although the "Herald and Watchman" was only $1, and the "Messenger and Universalist" is $2, by a moments examination they will perceive the latter is the CHEAPEST in proportion to its reading matter. The former was published EVERY OTHER week, at $1, while the latter is published EVERY week, on a much larger sheet and smaller type for only double the price, $2. In the former case the subscriber got 26 Numbers the year for $1, and in the latter he will get 52, with at least three times the reading, for only $2.

With regard to the VALUE of the exchange to the subscribers, we can of course say nothing. Time must determine this, the subscribers themselves being judges. Our best endeavors, however, will not be wanting to save them from LOSS in it. We hope they will one and all be disposed to give us a trial. The expense for one year will be trifling, and this will enable them to become sufficiently acquainted with the character of the Messenger.

Another consideration which we would urge for their acceptance of the exchange, (though this will only apply to his personal friends,) is, that Br. P.'s pecuniary advantage will be proportioned to the number who continue this paper in place of the Herald.

It will be seen that the Controversy between Dr. Ely and Br. Thomas is somewhat advanced. Should a sufficient number (to make it an object) of the patrons of the Herald and Watchman continue the Messenger, this Controversy will be be re-published to the present time, in the same form as the Messenger, so that they can have the whole in connexion.

In order to ascertain in the surest and most expeditious manner, who will continue, we shall forward this and the two succeeding numbers to each one, and all who do not signify to us, within the three weeks, by letter direct, (post paid,) or through their respective Post-Masters, their wish to have the Messenger continued, will be considered as declining it, and the paper stopped. These numbers will enable them to judge of the paper, and at the same time be as economical a method, perhaps, as we could adopt to ascertain their wishes. It will therefore be distinctly understood that each who wishes to continue, is to signify the same to us, as above stated, within three weeks, or the paper will otherwise be stopped at the end of that time.

P. PRICE.

Mr. T. J. SAWYER,

Dear Sir—I listened attentively to the discourse you delivered in the Church in the Sixth Avenue, on Sunday the 9th of March. I have also read with some attention your editorial article in No. 20 of the present volume of the Messenger and Universalist. In both, you have endeavored to prove from Scripture, the absolute impossibility of sinners escaping the punishment of their sins; and you have certainly made out a pretty strong case. Your quotations are apparently to the point, and were there not other texts which seem to hold forth a different view of the subject, I should be disposed to consider the question as settled.

That God 'will by no means clear the guilty,' 'He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong that he doeth,' &c. 'Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished.' 'He shall reward every man according to his works.' 'For we must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body, (or otherwise receive the things in body) according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad;' all these, and many other texts which might be quoted, go to prove the certainty of punishment for sin; but I find in the Bible a great deal said about forgiveness, remission of sins, &c. In the passage from which the first quotation above is taken, the Lord proclaims himself as 'the Lord God, merciful and gracious, &c. forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty.' This passage you quoted at length in your sermon, but only commented on the last clause. Again, 'if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins;' and we are taught to pray to our Father, to 'forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.' Christ said to his disciples on a certain occasion, 'whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them.' Many other passages might be adduced, but the above are sufficient for my present purpose.

Now, Sir, to 'forgive' is defined in Johnson's Dictionary, 'to pardon; not to punish; to pardon a crime; to remit; not to exact debt or penalty.' If sinners must, under all circumstances, suffer the entire punishment due for their transgressions, how are any ever to be forgiven?—How is any part of the debt or penalty not to be exacted, if the 'uttermost farthing' *must be paid?* If to forgive, is 'not to punish,' why are we commanded to confess our sins, in order to be forgiven, or to pray for forgiveness of them, on the supposition that we must in all cases receive punishment according to their enormity? I must confess I have pondered much on this subject, nor is my mind yet fully settled. May we not rationally conclude that the passages you quote in favor of your views are intended to apply to the sinner, who 'being often reproved hardeneth his neck,' and not to him, who confesseth his sins and humbly asketh his Heavenly Father to forgive them?

I wish to be enlightened on this subject, and as you have often expressed a wish to have your *opponents* come forward with their objections to your doctrine, that you might give them a place in the Messenger, together with your own observations in reply, I doubt not but you will extend the same favor to one who believes *with* you in the final 'restitution of all things.' I wish it distinctly understood that in speaking of the punishment the sinner is to receive for his transgressions, I have no reference to the time, place, or manner in which he is to suffer, but consider it a separate and distinct question.

Yours, affectionately. E.

REPLY.—The subject proposed by 'E.' is probably attended with some difficulties, and those difficulties are very much increased by the established modes of thinking and speaking upon it. The idea of *pardon* as belonging to the divine government is generally taken from its use in relation to human governments. As applicable to the latter, Dr. Johnson's definition of the word is undoubtedly correct. In human governments the power of pardon, that is, of *remitting punishment*, is often called into exercise. Human laws are necessarily *imperfect*, their administration is equally *imperfect*. Human testimony, upon which criminals are detected, condemned and punished, is *fallible*, and consequently every judgment founded thereon is subject to *error*. Now where there is a constant liability to err, it will sometimes be found necessary to *pardon*, under peculiar circumstances, in order to avoid being *unjust*. In other words, it will be better to punish not at all, than to punish beyond the culprit's ill-deserts

In the divine government, however, there is no imperfection. Our Lawgiver is also our judge. He knows the exact degree of our criminality, for he is acquainted with every palliating and every aggravating circumstance. And 'shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?'

In human governments *punishment* and *forgiveness* are regarded as opposites. He who is *punished* can be *forgiven*, and he who is *forgiven* cannot be *punished*. But there are many passages of Scripture which go to convince us that in the government of God they are perfectly consistent with each other. The Psalmist exclaims, 'Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth *mercy*; for *thou renderest to every man according to his works*' Nor is this declaration a paradox.—The divine *justice* and *mercy* are harmonious attributes. God is *merciful* in *justice*, and *just* in *mercy* If we do not acknowledge this, it seems to us we

'Set at odds Heaven's jarring attributes,
And with one excellence another wound.'

It is quite material, we think, to bear in mind the great difference between *forgiving sins*, and *remitting punishment*. And here the phraseology of Scripture is generally uniform. While they speak much of *forgiving sin, pardoning transgression*, &c. they say little of *remitting punishment*. In many instances indeed their language seems to be explicit in

affirming that while God rewards every man according to his works, he at the same time pardons some, or forgives their sins. See 2 Sam. xii, 9—14, also Num. xiv, 17—23. In Isaiah xl, 2, we read, 'Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that *her iniquity is pardoned*; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.'

From these and other examples we cannot but conclude that it is possible for God both to *pardon* and *punish* the same individual at the same time.—That he punishes every man according to his deserts, we cannot for a single moment doubt. This seems to be no less clearly revealed in the Scriptures, than required by infinite justice. Yet it is equally clear that he pardons those who confess their sins, and forgives the penitent. But in pardoning their sins, he by no means remits their punishment.

'Forgivness of sins' may be defined, *the removing, or taking away of sin*—not the withholding of deserved punishment—but *the destroying of the love* and *practice of sin itself*. If this definition is correct, we can readily see the propriety, the necessity of repentance, as a pre-requisite to forgiveness. He who is still in love with sin is altogether unprepared to have it forgiven, that is, *remitted, put away*. He would still cling to it.

These remarks will probably enable our valued friend to understand the passages which he has quoted in opposition to our views. He will readily see how God can '*forgive* iniquity, transgression and sin.' and yet, 'by no means clear the guilty;' and how, if we confess our sins, He can be faithful and just and still forgive them. S.

TEMPERANCE.

The cause of temperance we regard as the cause of humanity, and consequently as deserving of our attention, reverence, and co-operation. It seems impossible that any man can reflect on the thousand evils of Intemperance—the ruin of health which it occasions, the untimely graves it ignominiously fills, the degradation of intellect which it effects, the destruction of moral susceptibilities which it produces, the public and private miseries which follow in its train—and yet feel indifferent to the interests of that cause which proposes their annihilation and the upbuilding in their stead of virtue, intellect, health and happiness.

We rejoice in the success of labors designed to result in so great and wide spread good. And we devoutly pray that Being who is glorified when human nature is ennobled, purified and transformed into his own spotless image, to give power and efficacy to every measure devised by the 'wisdom which is from above' for the accomplishment of so desirable an object.

We have been led to these remarks by the receipt of a private letter from Mandarin, E. Florida, which mentions the existence of a Temperance Society in that place. It is believed to have been productive of much good. At its last meeting Ladies were admitted members, when fourteen subscribed to the articles of the Society. An address we learn is to be delivered at its next meeting, and the following lines are to be sung to the tune of 'Bonny Boat.' They were composed by a lady formerly of this city, now resident at Mandarin, whom the readers of the 1st vol. of the Messenger will recollect over the signature 'S. A. M.' We wish the Society success, and congratulate it on the accession to its talent and exemplary virtue in the person of their Poetess, Mrs. 'S. A D.' S,

Proverbs xx, 1.

Urge not on me the sparkling bowl,
Nor say 'twill drown my care;
Already hath it left the soul
A prey to fell despair.

Oh, not for me the wine cup fill
From purple clusters prest;
Ye call it nectar—can it still
The anguish of this breast?
In vain the blushing glass goes round,
The laugh, the song, the jest;
Each brain is with a serpent bound
And vultures gnaw each breast!
And sleepless nights of mad'ning sound
The fevered minds conjure,—
Of horrid phantoms pressing round
To make their victim sure.

Take back—take back the goblet grac'd
With wives and childrens tears;
And parents shame, and hope misplac'd
Of youths first promised years.
There's madness in the foaming can
There's poison in its breath,
And onward lures the victim, man
To folly—darkness—death!
In vain the blushing glass goes round
The laugh, the song, the jest;
Each brain is with a serpent bound
And vultures gnaw the breast.
Sleep brings no ease and morn no hope,
Clouds rest where once was light,
Creation's pride is left to grope
In one enduring night. S. A. D.

MANDARIN, March 5.

THE STANWICH DISCUSSION.

What has become of our friend Payne, the opponent of Br. Hillyer in the above Discussion? In our paper of March 1st we noticed the subject, and some objections of Mr. Payne to meeting in the Stamford House. We had hoped that a more mature reflection on the subject would have obviated whatever scruples he might have indulged at the first.—But we have heard nothing farther from him, or of the controversy, save an occasional report, (said to come from partialist clergymen who were present,) of the mighty victory obtained by Mr. Payne over Br. Hillyer If the latter was so totally discomfitted, why is there such an aversion in the neighborhood of Stamford, *from some source*, to their meeting before another audience, that the falsity of Universalism may be again demonstrated? Why do not the Rev. gentlemen, who are giving such a bright picture of the first meeting, exert all their influence to bring about the second? And why, if Mr. Payne possessed so decided an advantage over his opponent, why was the Stanwich house so suddenly closed against them? The Partialist denomination, as well as others, is not generally slow to avail themselves of advantages of this kind. We frankly confess we should desire to improve it. If our friend was building up truth, and demolishing error, we should say, keep open churches, every thing that would afford a shelter, for days, weeks, months—aye, and for *years!* This is human nature, and there are few who would not exhibit it. There certainly must be something wrong with our Partialist brethren in this matter.

After it was rumored that there were objections to using the Stamford Meeting House, the editor of the Stamford Sentinel, at the suggestion of several of his patrons, proffered the Disputants a reasonable space in his columns, weekly, for them to continue the Discussion by writing, provided their articles were couched in proper language. The Sentinel of the 3d ult. contains the following Note from Br. Hillyer on the subject. The Sentinel had not then heard any thing from Mr. Payne, and we cannot learn that any thing has since transpired expressive of his feelings, or that any disposition is exhibited to resume the Discussion, *in any form*. We really like to see things *finished*, when they are once *commenced*. What does it mean? P.

Mr. Editor—By the last Sentinel I perceive that you are willing to grant Mr. Payne and myself an opportunity of discussing, through the medium of your paper, the subject held in debate between us at Stanwich. Your offer is generous, and shows a disposition to encourage freedom of inquiry upon the important subject of religion. But I have no right, neither am I willing, to do any thing to change, or to render void, the articles of agreement already entered into between Mr. Payne and myself. We adjourned from the Stanwich house, to resume the discussion as soon as another suitable place could be obtained. The Stamford meeting house, I am assured, on good authority, has been granted for the purpose by the proper persons. I am ready to resume the debate there. If, however, we should finally be deprived of this house also, I am willing, on my part, should it meet Mr. Payne's approbation, to *suspend* that particular part of the agreement which relates to an *oral* debate, until another house is obtained, and enter with him the columns of your paper, provided each party have the privilege of calling the other from a *written* to an *oral* discussion, whenever a suitable house is procured. Mr. Payne, will, no doubt, give his views upon this subject. Yours Respectfully,

S. J. HILLYER.

Brooklyn, Feb. 26, 1834.

NEW STYLE OF TRACTS.

We noticed in our last, a very laconic *written* Tract ('You must die! O! Eternity!') which was carefully placed under the door of our office. We are since informed by a friend that a similar thing was placed under his door recently, from which we infer that a new race or order of Tracts are springing into existence—that the ever fruitful minds of our partialist friends have hit upon another expedient by which to gain access to our dwellings—*even by the door-sill*, and that in all probability the community are to undergo a visitation from, or be inundated for a time with this *pigmy* race of Tracts.—With what untiring zeal do the originators of these *little* schemes pursue their object—a zeal altogether worthy of a better cause. How much they depend upon alarming the *fears* of men, instead of drawing them to the love and worship of God, by a consideration of that 'love' wherewith he *first* loved us.—How would the knowledge of salvation roll on, like the waves of some mighty river, were Universalists to exhibit the same perseverance (with less impudence) in the cause of impartial grace? May God speedily grant our partialist friends a better cause, than that of proclaiming his ceaseless wrath to his own offspring, wherein to exercise their zeal. P.

NEW-YORK.

Our prospects in this city, (New-York,) may be regarded flattering in the extreme. The second Society under the pastoral labors of Br. Sawyer, have now a house of their own—a home, and Br. Le Fevre has just commenced his labors under the most favorable circumstances with the third Society. Under the united labors of these brethren, we cannot but enjoy a prosperity equal to our most sanguine expectations.

It will be gratifying also to our readers to learn that we shall be favored with frequent contributions to our columns from the pen of Br. Le Fevre.

In view of all existing circumstances, we cannot but say, Brethren, take courage—a brighter day is dawning on this region. P.

☞ A Special Request. ☜

In another place we have requested those of the former patrons of the 'Herald and Watchman' who may receive the 'Messenger and Universalist,' to advise us immediately through their Post Masters, ☞*if they wish the paper continued.* People are so apt to forget in these cases, that we take the liberty of repeating the condition—all who do not signify

to us their wish to take the Messenger, *within three weeks*, will be considered as declining, and the paper will accordingly be stopped. This time will be abundant for returns from any place for which we have names. Will they therefore oblige us this once, in giving prompt attention to this request, that we may know how many to print for that portion of our subscribers? If any of the individuals to whom the paper is sent cannot conveniently retain it for themselves, will they not loan the numbers and speak a word to their friends and acquaintances in reference to it? Any assistance in this way will be gratefully acknowledged. P.

From a recent private communication from Br. Townsend, of Gaines, Orleans co. we venture to make the following extract, as of general interest.—It was probably one of the visits alluded to below, that called forth the gentlemanly and christian conduct of the editor of the 'Canadian Wesleyan,' towards Br. T. as exhibited in an article from that paper in the present number. Br. T. may be thankful that the meek and unassuming editor can only assail him with the *tongue*—though this little member sometimes contains the poison of asps. Our extract follows:

"The province of Upper Canada, as far as I am informed, has hitherto been destitute of Universalist preaching. Having a connexion located in the county town of Gore District, I have visited that place twice. The first time, one year ago last fall—the last time, in October last. I lately received a letter from there highly encouraging, and saying that a spirit of inquiry was abroad—that another visit was anxiously looked for—that there were found to be, on inquiry, quite a number of believers in the restitution of all things, and that the liberal part of the inhabitants had determined to build a school house for the accommodation of those who had no other place for preaching. More than this, I was opposed with much bitterness during my last visit, by a young man who was preparing for a Presbyterian preacher, and had spent about a year to learn that art and mystery. Since my return he has bolted, been turned out of the synagogue, and needs, I believe, only information to make him a zealous Universalist. * * * * * * Br. James W. Hickock, whose name is forwarded to you, has been studying with me for some time past, and preaching occasionally to general acceptance. He is a young man of good moral character, and will probably obtain employment for the present year, somewhere in this section."

METHODIST MAGNANIMITY.

Our readers, (says the Utica Magazine and Advocate,) are already aware that the Editors of the Methodist Christian Advocate and Journal, of New York, utterly decline publishing, and *dare* not publish the *Universalist* side of the controversy between Messrs. Morse and Lee; and that too, after having given the parties and the public a partial promise, and good reasons to expect they would do it. They thus *acted out Partialism* in every respect; they dare not come to the light, nor allow their readers to see but one side of the discussion. In addition to this partiality, cowardice and injustice in the New-York Methodists, we have a similar example of the same unrighteous and pusillanimous spirit lately manifested by the Methodists in Canada, towards Br. Townsend, as follows:

From the Canadian Wesleyan.

Extract of a letter signed K. Townsend, dated Paris, [Gaines,] N. Y., January 18, 1834.

Editor of the Canadian Wesleyan—Having noticed a number of articles in your paper, signed, *A Friend to Truth*, as well as a communication from Mr. Jackson, I would simply ask the question, can I have an opportunity to reply to the arguments made use of by those persons against Universalism through your columns? This will enable yourself or your correspondents, to show to the world the inconsistencies of Universalism, if it in reality be an error. Should you decline giving me this privilege, will you publish this request, and favor myself and your readers with your reasons for declining.

Remarks by the Editor of the Wesleyan.

Let it be observed, that the Editor of the *Canadian Wesleyan*, never has, nor never intends to attack men or principles, without admitting a reply, if desired, when *truth* and *reason* are united in the production. But to place himself under an obligation to publish the unlimited productions of controvertialists, might at once subject the establishment to very great expense; *for instance, should the parties see cause to be prolix in their reply, it would require at least one additional hand to set manuscript—price seven dollars per week*, an expense the editor would be very unwilling to tax himself with. 2. The editor cannot for one moment think himself justifiable in allowing the *doctrine of devils (Ye shall not surely die")* promulgated through the columns of the Canadian Wesleyan, a doctrine rigidly taught by the Universalians. 3. The editor is decidedly of opinion, that the greater part of those calling themselves Universalians, are *virtually* enemies of the cross of Christ, i. e. they neglect Christian duty—*curse, swear*, and in general, conform to the maxims of the world, contrary to the precepts of the gospel. 4. The editor is of opinion, that if the Universalians make a practice of perverting the sayings, and diminishing the acts of their opponents, (as Mr. Townsend has that of Elder J. Jackson's of which Mr. Townsend has reference to,) vanity would characterise the opponents of such defalcators of truth. 5. The editor would offer one reason more, if the Universalians be right, all are on their way to heaven, then all are right; and it would be folly to reason about that, that does not, nor never will exist, *an eternal hell and eternal punishment.* 6. To conclude, the editor is decidedly of opinion, that Universalians in general, advocate the unconditional salvation of all men, under the same influence that he himself once did, and if so, servant of the devil. The editor presumes the above will fill an aching void for some time, and it may prevent his particular friend, Mr. Townsend, from acknowledging him a gentleman in future; however, that matters not. The editor has long since become acquainted with the smiles and frowns of men, and had sooner have the approbation of his God, and enjoy an acquitted conscience, than to sail before all the universal breezes on the globe.

UNIVERSALISM AND PARTIALISM.

Many persons affect surprise, when they hear Universalists rejoicing in their belief. They suppose if the doctrine be true, that the less said about it, the better. We purpose in this article, to show some reasons why we love to dwell on the theme of universal benevolence. We shall briefly point out the difference between the system and the prevailing belief, prefacing our labor with a single remark, applicable to the spirit of the age. Universalism is more generally believed than professed;—Partialism is more generally professed than believed. Our numbers would be greatly augmented, if men were honest, and had sufficient moral courage to stand forth in defence of their real belief.

1. Universalism is ever before its advocates. We can press forward toward the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, for we have always something to learn. New and powerful arguments are constantly coming to light. The early advocates of this scheme barely entered on the most glorious and magnificent truth ever presented to the mind. Partialism is always behind its advocates. Whole churches yet far beyond their creeds, and such is the state of the times, that the church must go back to the creed, or the creed must be brought up to the church. Partialists can more easily alter and improve their creeds than they can the mind; they generally prefer the former.

2. The hope and faith of Universalists are in perfect agreement. The hope and faith of Partialists are directly contrary. There is, in many cases, a wide difference between hope and belief. A child may go into a distant land, and the parents may hear of his death and believe the account, but they certainly cannot hope it is true. A merchant may richly freight his ship, and send it to a foreign port. After her departure, he may hear of her total loss, and believe the report, but he cannot hope such to be the fact. A man might have believed when the cholera was in this country, that it would eventually destroy two thirds of the whole population, but he certainly could not hope such would be the result, unless he was destitute of all human feeling. So there may be a belief in the interminable misery of some of the human race, but to hope such to be the fate of any being, would be to show the heart of a demon. However mankind may differ in their belief, they all agree in desiring the final happiness of the world.

3. The joy of Universalists is proportioned to the strength of their faith. The joy of Partialists is proportioned to the weakness of their belief. Once assure the advocates of endless torture, that their doctrine will prove true, and more wretched beings could not exist. Let the Universalist realize the glory and extent of his doctrine, and greater happiness he could not enjoy. Let the Partialist realize the limits and terror of his belief, and more misery he could not feel.

4. If all men were converted to Universalism, this world would be a paradise. If to Partialism, it would be a hell. If every being believed endless misery, and acted from it, there would not be a good man on earth. If all men were governed by Universalism, there would not be a bad man in existence. One is a system of love, the other of terror. One appeals to the affections, the other to the passions.

5. Universalism is endless. We may sit down and run through all the arguments in favor of Partialism. Not so with Universalism. While we are studying one and carrying it out to its legitimate result, others appear of equal weight and importance. Scarcely a single new idea has been presented in support of Partialism within the last half century, while Universalists have obtained during that time, such a host of arguments, that no man can number them.

Universalism and Partialism may be compared to a rock. The former, is large enough for a world to stand on. The latter is only large enough for a part. Partialism now is like a rock on which a deceived mariner may seat himself in escaping from a shipwreck, but he soon finds that the waters are rapidly flowing over it, and if he does not leave the rock, the rock will soon leave him. Partialists are running out of their doctrine. Universalists are running into their's.

To contemplate Universalism, is like wandering through the apartments of a beautiful and magnificent palace, where new beauties strike the eye in every direction. To contemplate Partialism, is like descending into the dark and dreary caverns of earth, where hideousness and deformity are presented on every hand.

Let the reader follow out these comparisons, and he will soon be decided in his choice.

Universalist Watchman.

Married,

In Clarkson, Monroe co. N. Y. by Rev. K. Townsend, Mr. BENJAMIN T. PERRIGO and Miss EMELINE PRICE, daughter of Henry Price, all of that town.

RENTING OF PEWS.

The Pews of the Orchard-st. Church, will be rented for the ensuing year on Monday afternoon next, commencing at 3 o'clock.

By order of the Trustees, April 5th, 1834.

DESTINY.—A Dialogue.

LELIA.

Little stream, where art thou wandering,
O'er the pebbles coursing free,
About ravine and rock meandering,
Tell me, where's thy destiny?

STREAM.

First I mingle with the river,
Next roll with it to the sea;
Then to the cloud, my yast receiver—
Changing is my destiny.

LELIA.

Summer zephyr, mildly blowing,
Soft alike on lake and lea;
Stop awhile, where art thou going—
Tell me where's thy destiny?

ZEPHYR.

Around the world my way I'm winging,
Earth has no resting place for me,
Alike o'er land and sea I'm springing—
Changing is my destiny.

LELIA.

Life, like the stream, is constant wending,
And like the breeze its doom must be,
Wearing onward to its ending—
Changing is life's destiny.

New-York Mirror.

FIT EMBLEM OF MAN.

See, how beneath the moonbeams' smile
Yon little billow heaves its breast,
And foams and sparkles for a while,
And murmuring then subsides to rest.

Thus man, the sport of bliss and care,
Rises on time's eventful sea;
And having swelled a moment there,
Thus melts into eternity.

DECAY OF NATURE.

Every one's experience and observation must prove the insufficiency of all terrestrial objects to impart peace and permanent enjoyment. The perishable things of this world are incapable of satisfying the capacious desires of the immortal soul. For lasting felicity, we must look to a source sure and unfailing. All things beneath the sun are mutable, and subject to decay; and even if unchangeable and imperishable, they would yield but a temporary gratification. Life is short and uncertain. The sundering ties of nature—the knell that speaks of departing friends, daily admonishes us that we are accountable—that we are mortal, and that this earth is not our abiding home. We all naturally desire happiness; but seek in one way or another, an *imaginary*, rather than a real good. We eagerly endeavour to seize the gilded phantom which eludes our grasp. Disappointed in our first expectations, we, renew our exertions, and again indulge in the delusions of hope. Our minds are actuated by some other alluring object, and we fancy we should be happy in its attainment. With renewed ardor, we pursue it.

"But like the circle-bounding earth and skies,
It lures from far, yet as we follow flies."

Thus are all our efforts to obtain this expected good defeated, and all our schemes of happiness again fall. Day after day is spent in the vain pursuit of the same happiness, deceiving ourselves by mistaking its true source and object; and consequently, never arriving at what we aim. Instead of following the straight and open way which leads to peace and joy, we choose the dangerous path that winds (in imagination) through flowery fields and groves, but ends in wretchedness and wo! We amuse ourselves in plucking the roses which adorn the way, regardless of the thorn; until, like Obediah, we find the day is spent and we have gained nothing. We regard not the poison and the fatal consequences of thus misspending our time, and neglecting the one thing needful. Instead of "laying up treasures in heaven, where moth and rust do not corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal," we are laying up treasures on earth which perish—feeding upon husks, and satisfying ourselves with the empty shadows of this world. All our hopes of comfort and unmingled gratification from any thing short of the pure principles of religion, will ever prove fallacious—our nearest and dearest relations cannot impart to us any consolation beyond the grave! our affection for them, may be the unconscious means of leading us away from our duty to our Maker. Those to whom we look for advice, may prove the enemies of our peace; and those whom we trust to direct us in the way we should go, may become snares to our feet. We should learn the failing of all our expectations of endless fruition, from others; for this, we must look to ourselves and to our God, and not to others. The rude hand of death will soon sever the ties that bind our affections to every earthly object. Those forms on which we delighted to gaze, and which appear too lovely to decay, will soon be laid in the dust! The eye which beamed so much loveliness and benevolence will soon be closed forever! That tongue which is wont to speak to us words of consolation will soon be hushed and silent as the tomb! Can we then trust to our arm of flesh for consolation? Can our nearest connexions be to us an unfailing support in the hour of dissolution, or give us comfort in the grave? They, like ourselves, will soon be cut down, and pass away as the flower of the fields. Wealth has many alluring charms. It maketh many friends, and may convey a short-lived gratification. But "riches take to themselves wings and fly away;" or if retained, are as often a source of misery as enjoyment. Honor in all, its captivating dress is but an empty name, and can excite but a transient joy. It is a mere bubble blown by the wind. Those who are crowned with honors one day, may, on the next, "find none so poor as to do them reverence." The fashionable amusements of the world are vain and unsatisfying. If they sometimes produce pleasurable sensations, they are often attended with vexation and disgust, and seldom afford the votaries of pleasure their anticipated enjoyment. By a too frequent indulgence, they disqualify the mind for serious reflections and improvement, and unfit the soul for the residence of every heavenly virtue. Those who have thus sought happiness, have met with disappointment, and can testify that their promises are vain. Thus, many of us pass our days seeking that in unworthy objects, which religion alone can give. It alone can sustain us in the hour of affliction—can atone for the waste of years—the desolation of our dearest hopes, and smooth our journey to the tomb.

"His hand the good man fastens on the sky,
And bids earth roll, nor feels her idle whirl."

Southern Pioneer.

THE HAPPINESS OF HEAVEN.

To the eye of man, the sun appears a pure light, a mass of unmingled glory. Were we to ascend with a continued flight towards this luminary, and could we, like the eagle, gaze upon its lustre, we should in our progress behold its splendor become every moment more intense. As we rose through the heavens, we should see a little orb changing gradually into a great world: and as we advanced nearer and nearer, should behold it expanding every way, until all that was before us, became an universe of excessive and immeasurable glory. Thus the heavenly inhabitant will, at the commencement of his happy existence, see the divine system filled with magnificence and splendor, and arrayed in beauty: and as he advances onwards through the successive periods of duration, will behold all things more and more luminous, transporting, and sun-like for ever.—*Dwight.*

HOPE.

Were the entire principle of Hope to be erased from the human mind, that there might be a single foothold for a resting place neither *here* nor *hereafter*, I question whether the spirit of man could bear itself up. The weight of despair which would be the natural consequence, would so press him down, that even should the *small loon of existence* be still granted him, that existence would be bereft of the most ennobling gift of Heaven, and like a rudderless barque on the ocean, be driven hither and thither guideless, until the great whirlpool of Death shall entomb the HOPELESS WANDERER!—*Weekly Messenger.*

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of the Messenger it is merely necessary to say, that no essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth, to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a *world's reconciliation to God.*

Its motto may be, perhaps, the surest index to its character. It breathes neither wrath nor fury to the chileren of men, but on the contrary, it points to a peaceful messenger on the mountain top, proclaiming "good tidings" and publishing peace." *"How beautiful upon the mountains, are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace."*

An interesting Discussion between Rev. E. S. Ely, (Presbyterian) and A. C. Thomas, one of the editors, is now in progress in its columns.

With unfeigned gratitude to the Universalist public for the many tokens of approbation bestowed upon our paper for the 2 years it has now been in existence, we submit these Proposals for the third volume, referring simply to the past, as a pledge for the future.

CONDITIONS.

The "*N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist,*" is published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at $2 per annum, *in advance*, or $2,50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE, *Publisher and Proprietor.*

Beauties of Aminio-Calvinism.

Just published and for sale at this office, a neat 18 mo. pamphlet of 36 closely printed pages, entitled, "*The Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism; or, the story of Deacon Caleb Comfort, to which is added the vision of Deacon Peter Pious.*" This pamphlet comprises the five articles which have recently appeared in the columns of the Messenger, under the head *Five chapters on Partialism*, and are designed to exhibit the change which has come over the Presbyterian denomination within a few years. Price $4 per 100, or 6 cents single.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,
Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square.